

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 266 625

FL 015 430

AUTHOR Rado, Marta
 TITLE Text Building Devices in Intercultural Conversations.
 PUB DATE 85
 NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Congress of the Australian Universities Language and Literature Association (23rd, Melbourne, Australia, 1985). For related document, see FL 015 431.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Communicative Competence (Languages); *Connected Discourse; Discourse Analysis; Elementary Education; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; *Intercultural Communication; Interlanguage; Interpersonal Communication; Language Usage; *Parent Influence; *Peer Influence; Pronouns; Speech Communication; Young Children
 IDENTIFIERS Australia; *Ellipsis; *Referents (Linguistics)

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the use of pronoun and demonstrative reference and ellipsis as cohesive devices in conversation between interlanguage-speaking parents, their children, and the children's classmates. The 24 subjects included eight Italian-, Greek-, and Macedonian-speaking migrant parents, their primary-school-age children, and the children's classmates, matched for language, teacher-assessed ability, and sex. The parents were all second language or interlanguage speakers whose English showed linguistically deviant forms with varying density. The language corpus consisted of responses in interviews concerning attitudes toward schooling, bilingualism, use of languages other than English in and outside the home, sociocultural identity, and multiculturalism in Australia. It was found that the subjects made ample use of ellipsis rather than pronoun or demonstrative reference for making replies cohesive. The groups differed in their ability to produce morphosyntactically and pragmatically well-formed replies, with the parents the least competent in this, followed by the children and classmates. These and other results suggest a weak parental influence on the cohesiveness of children's speech in dyadic exchanges and a need for special attention to cohesive devices in primary school language and general curricula. Numerous tables and a bibliography are appended. (MSE)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

TEXT BUILDING DEVICES IN INTERCULTURAL CONVERSATIONS

Marta Rado

Paper presented at the Australian Universities Language and Literature
Association 23rd Congress, 1985.

- U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
- ☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marta Rado

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED266625

FL015430

INTRODUCTION

For most people the oral channel, particularly conversation, is the main mode of communication. This is the case in both intra- and intercultural situations. Conversations are texts created co-operatively by more than one individual. As texts conversations must be coherent, that is, they must make sense. Usually they are also cohesive by employing specific linguistic devices.

It is through parental conversations that children are first introduced and continue to be exposed to the cohesive properties of language which play an important role in the understanding and writing of expository prose.

In English, which is our concern here, the numerous cohesive devices include pronoun and demonstrative reference, and ellipsis (for a detailed discussion of cohesive devices in English, see Halliday and Hasan, 1976). These are the devices that have been selected for observation in the conversations of eight migrant parents, their primary-school-age children and their contemporaries to be referred to as '(class) mates', matched for language, teacher assessed ability and sex.

The small numbers indicate a case study approach. The study has two aspects. Firstly it describes some properties of the conversational responses of the parents, children and mates. Secondly, it compares some features of their language use. The parents were all second or interlanguage speakers, whose English displayed linguistically deviant forms with varying density. Such deviant forms are based on an individual's idiosyncratic language system in contrast to the shared system

or 'grammar' of a language. The term 'grammar' is used here in its broadest sense which includes both morphosyntactic and sociolinguistic rules. What is important to note about interlanguage is that it is a partly unshared system.

METHODOLOGY

In order to see how interlanguage speaking parents, their children and the children's class mates participated in the co-operative production of texts a particular form of conversation, the dialogue was selected. This dialogue took the form of an interview conducted by the same interviewer conversing with the respondents about their attitude to schooling, bilingualism, the use of languages other than English in and outside the home, socio-cultural identity and multiculturalism in Australia.

The respondents were 4 Italian, 2 Greek and 2 Macedonian speaking parents (8 in all), their children and the children's mates, giving a total of 24 subjects selected from a group interviewed in 1984 in the context of a larger study which is being conducted in collaboration with Dr. Lois Foster. This study includes 22 Italian, Greek and Macedonian speaking parents, their children and their mates. Although the interviews were structured to ensure the coverage of all topics, supplementary questions were asked to gather further information where this appeared to be of interest. The parent interviews lasted from 60-90 minutes, the child and mate interviews from 30-45 minutes.

Since the focus of this study is on the use of selected cohesive devices in verbal interaction only the first utterance of an adjacency

pair was considered for the analysis. Adjacency pairs are verbal sequences produced by two speakers immediately following each other (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1973: 295-6).

In order to make the responses comparable across the three groups, 40 answers were considered, 20 to yes-no and 20 to wh- questions received by each individual giving a total of 320 answers to be analysed. These question-answer pairs were chosen because they significantly outnumbered the others, such as tag, alternative and declarative questions (for details of question types in English see Quirk and Greenbaum (1973: 191-199). For the sampling of question-answer pairs, the same procedure was adopted as for a previous study concerned with "Ellipsis in answers to yes-no and wh- questions in the English of Asian students in Australia". (Rado, forthcoming). First a sampling fraction was established for each question and then questions were uniformly sampled across the sample. By this method 40 adjacency pairs were identified for each respondent.

The features of speech observed were pronoun and demonstrative reference and ellipsis. These are three frequently occurring cohesive devices. What they have in common is that they can only fulfil both their message bearing and cohesive functions if their meaning is recoverable from a previous stretch of text. These two functions are intimately related, in that all three cohesive devices considered concern shared knowledge or given information already expressed in the text. In other words, these devices cannot signal new information. Most importantly, their use is based on both grammatical and discourse rules. Ellipsis is not the arbitrary omission of items which must appear in well-formed utterances (Dulay, Burt and Krashen, 1982: 154). It occurs when "propositions are not fully realized in the grammatical forms of utterances" (Shopen, 1973: 65).

Compare ungrammatical omissions in adjacency pair 1.1 with ellipsis in adjacency pairs 1.2 and 1.3.

1.1 What are the things you like?

All depends ones you used to, use here.

1.2 Does he always speak Macedonian to you?

He does not speak Macedonian all the time.

1.3 What else do you like?

Reading, stories, writing.

The second part pair of 1.2 is an ellipted sentence, that of 1.3 a fragment. Fragments have a special status because they "constitute grammatical sequences, but do not conform to the speaker's intuitive notion of sentencehood... (In other respects) fragments have the properties of full sentences: they consist of elements taken from the lexicon; some sequences are judged to be well formed and some are not..., there are an infinite number of such fragments" (Morgan, 1973: 720-21). Shopen (1973: 65) holds that a "command of ellipsis is an important part of knowing a language". Morgan reinforces this view when he states "that the speaker's ability to produce and interpret fragments is a matter of the same linguistic competence that enables him to deal with full sentences" (pp.720-21).

The text that provided the material for the analysis was the first utterance of the second part of an adjacency pair. A study of these led to the identification of the following answer types.

1. Formulaic answers, i.e. 'yes' or 'no' or 'routine' expressions.¹
2. Fragments, i.e. grammatical utterances that were syntactically incomplete.²

3. Ellipted sentences, i.e. utterances that were syntactically complete but nonetheless did not contain all the information lexicalised in the question.³
4. Complete or non-ellipted sentences, i.e. utterances that were syntactically complete and contained all the information lexicalised in the question.⁴
5. Alternative answers that formed a second part pair to the question but had no syntactic or lexical ties with it.⁵
6. Main and subordinate clauses and complex sentences where the question was to be understood as the ellipted preceding clause.⁶
7. Ellipted clauses and fragment clauses where the question was to be understood as the ellipted preceding clause.⁷
8. Unclassifiable answers, i.e. utterances that consisted of false starts, and/or were disconnected, and/or unfinished and so could not be assigned to any category.⁸

DISCUSSION

Communicative Competence

In order to gain an indication of respondent's global language competence, answers were classified according to their appropriateness or inappropriateness judged from a morphosyntactic and pragmatic point of view. This classification made it possible to compare the communicative competence of the three groups as well as that of individual respondents. I shall refer to an inappropriate response as a faulty answer (FA). Such answers do not necessarily lead to a breakdown or miscommunication. However, they are likely to create difficulties as they need repair work from hearers, thereby adding to their processing load.⁹

INSERT - <u>Table 1: Faulty Answers by Question Types</u>

with 18 per cent in response to yes-no questions. This is more similar to the mates (16% vs. 49%) than to parents where the distribution of full sentence answers was almost evenly balanced between answers to the two types of questions (34% vs. 35%).

The use of 'yes' was similar in frequency across the three groups, approximately one quarter, whereas 'no' was used much less by all three, approximately in ten per cent of answers. Children used it more often than parents or mates. The use of routines was similar to that of 'yes'. Of course 'yes' can also serve as a device linking contingency pairs or as a filler in pre-, post- or median utterance position. Eighteen per cent of parent answers contained this type of 'yes'. In contrast children and mates only made sporadic use of it. The lesser use of 'no' could be imputed to the infrequency of false presuppositions by the interviewees, but in part perhaps also to the pragmatically more difficult 'no'. It denies the interlocutor's belief but does not indicate what the belief should be. In addition, because of its negative associations it has some 'face' threatening qualities (for a discussion on 'face' in verbal interaction see Goffman, 1969) and therefore there might be a tendency to avoid it. For example, 'no' can be mitigated by replacing it by a routine such as 'I don't think so'. Routines apart from their mitigating role are also useful fillers giving the speaker time to organise the next segment of speech.

INSERT - Table 4: Formulaic Answers by Question Types

If one now looks at the association between questions and answers the following picture emerges (Refer to Table 4). Parents, children and mates overwhelmingly answered yes-no questions with 'yes' compared with wh-

Table 1 shows that approximately one third of parent responses were in some way impaired, making the hearer's task more difficult. One tenth of the children's answers were also faulty compared with one per cent of the mates' despite the fact that these children are Australian born and English dominant. The occurrence of faulty parent answers varied from 14 to 55 per cent, that of the children from 3 to 28 per cent. Note that all children and all parents gave some faulty answers, whereas not all the mates did. Question types did not seem to influence the appropriateness of parents' answers. However, children had more problems with wh- questions. Twice as many of the answers to these were faulty compared with answers to yes-no questions (wh- questions 14% vs. yes-no questions 7%).

Answer Types

INSERT - Table 2: Answer Types by Question Types

Table 1 shows that the most frequently used answer types by the three groups were unelaborated formulaic answers, namely 'yes', 'no', and/or routine answers which were not continued, and fragments. Other answers were given much less often. On the whole children were closer in frequency of use to mates than to parents.

Since ellipsis is the main concern of this paper, contrasting fragments and ellipted sentence answers with full sentence answers was considered of interest. As the data in Table 3 shows, question types influenced the use of fragments for the three groups. This was most apparent in the case of children. The 44 per cent fragment answers was the same as for the parents. Interestingly wh- questions also elicited comparatively more ellipted answers from children, i.e. 41 per cent, compared

questions. In the case of children and mates the difference is more dramatic than in the case of the parents (parents yes-no questions 39% vs. wh- questions 9%, children yes-no questions 49% vs. wh- questions 2%, mates yes-no questions 47% vs. wh- questions 0.6%). In this respect children are closer to mates than to parents. The same can be said for the use of 'no' in answer to yes-no questions. Their infrequent use in answer to wh- questions is similar across the groups. This is not surprising as wh- questions clearly indicate the new information, sought other than 'yes' or 'no', by providing a 'Q' element that is to be replaced in the answer. After all there is a special question form for 'yes' or 'no' answers. Routine answers to yes-no and wh- questions present a different picture. In the case of parents the majority of these were also used in replies to yes-no questions, but this was not so in the case of children and mates. Both groups gave twice as many answers containing a routine to wh- questions than to yes-no questions. Mates were the most frequent users of routines. This is surprising because there is some evidence that first and second language learners use routines early (see Gleason and Weintraub, 1975; Peters, 1983; Rado, forthcoming). Therefore one would have thought that speakers with more limited formal communicative skills would rely more heavily on the availability of prefabricated or routine expressions.

Formulaic or 'yes', 'no' and 'routine' answers are of interest because they make total ellipsis, namely the non-realisation of the whole of a proposition, possible. Their appropriate use requires the comprehension of the question and familiarity with the English yes-no answering system which vacillates between a positive-negative and agreement-disagreement system with a tendency towards the former. (For details of yes-no answer systems see Pope, 1973). Formulaic answers that are not continued do not involve productive language skills. Their role in conversational

text building is minimal. They simply keep the conversation going by confirming or disconfirming the presupposition or belief expressed by the previous speaker. In other words, they establish the validity or otherwise of the new information introduced by the interlocutor and not by the speaker. This type of ellipsis I shall call unelaborated total ellipsis in contrast to clausal ellipsis which occurs in responses that treat the question as if it were a preceding, albeit ellipted main clause or independent sentence.

INSERT - Table 5: Formulaic Answers not Elaborated

One might be justified in assuming that individuals who are interlanguage speakers and primary school age children who are in the language development stage would favour 'yes', 'no' and routine answers as these formulaic expressions make unelaborated total ellipsis possible. In other words, they are easy answers. In fact the parents, despite their lesser language skills, used fewer of these than children and the mates with the mates being the most frequent users (parents 53%, vs. children 56%, and mates 59%). Moreover, parents resorted relatively infrequently to unelaborated total ellipsis (parents 11%, children 31%, mates 24%) (Refer to Table 5)

INSERT - Table 6: Elaboration by Question Type

If one looks at answers from the converse point of view, namely that of elaboration or continuation, one finds that parents continued answers to yes-no and wh- questions in equal proportions (1/5) whereas children and

mates continued fewer answers with a tendency of elaborating more answers to wh- questions. (Refer to Table 6)

INSERT - <u>Table 7: Elaboration by Answer Type</u>
--

As evidenced by data in Table 7, parents and children continued more fragment answers than mates. The first two groups may have felt insecure with this grammatical form which does not have full sentencehood status.

It might also be interesting to compare briefly the use of formulaic answers by these respondents and a group of foreign (Asian) senior secondary and tertiary students in Australia (for details see Rado, forthcoming). These foreign students were also interlanguage speakers but have had considerably more formal education including tuition in English. They too gave more 'yes' than 'no' responses and more of these to yes-no than to wh- questions. Similarly to parents they continued most of these answers. The use of routines is similar across all four groups. What seems to matter in the elaboration of 'yes' and 'no' answers is age rather than language skill. Perhaps reduplication also deserves a comment. In addition to routines which often play the role of fillers, repetition of the same or a string of elements occurred in eight per cent of parent replies. Children almost never reduplicated in this way. In conclusion, it may be worth noting that in the use of formulaic answers, there was little difference between the sexes within the three groups.

Constituent Ellipsis and Lexicalisation

The constituents selected for the analysis were:

Subject noun phrase (SNP); Verb groups (VG); Predicate noun phrase (PNP); Predicate adjective (PAJ); Adverbial phrase (AVP); and Prepositional phrase (PP).

INSERT - Table 8: Ellipted Constituents by Question Types

INSERT - Table 9: Lexicalised Constituents by Question Types

As the data in Tables 8 and 9 indicate, the parents, children and mates ellipted and lexicalised constituents in a similar way with respect to frequency and distribution between yes-no and wh- questions. Generally, ellipsis of constituents occurred in similar proportions in answers to both types of questions with the exception of predicate noun phrases which were used more often in answers to yes-no questions.

The frequency with which constituents were lexicalised in fragments and ellipted sentences is also fairly similar. The distribution of constituent lexicalisation between the questions varies somewhat from group to group but the differences are not remarkable.

INSERT - Table 10: The Rank Order of Ellipted Constituent Types

As evidenced by the data in Table 10 the rank order of occurrence of ellipted constituents is remarkably similar across the three groups. The

information most frequently dispensable, because given, seems to be the subject noun phrase, closely followed by the verb group. In the answers of these respondents the other constituents played an insignificant role from the point of view of ellipsis.

INSERT - Table 11: The Rank Order of Lexicalised Constituent Types

The rank order of occurrence of lexicalised constituents is similar in the answers of parents and children. The mates differ somewhat, but as Table 11 shows, the differences are not great. The data reveal that fragments and ellipted sentences were likely to contain an adverbial phrase or predicate noun phrase. These constituents would probably express the new information.

INSERT - Table 12: Number of Individuals Ellipting Constituent Types by Question Types

INSERT - Table 13: Number of Individuals Lexicalising Constituent Types in Ellipted Utterances by Question Types

As data in Table 12 and 13 indicate, subject noun phrases, verb groups and adverbial phrases were ellipted by all respondents in answers to both types of questions. The same can be said about lexicalised adverbial phrases. On the other hand predicate adjectives were ellipted or expressed only by a few individuals. It might be of interest to note that more parents lexicalised the full range of constituents than children and mates. On the other hand some constituents did not only play a minor role in ellipsis, but also their importance was further reduced by not being used at all by some individuals spread across the three groups.

Children made few errors in ellipted utterances and only one male did. Parent errors occurred in ellipted noun phrases, verb groups and predicate noun phrases. In lexicalisation, parents made errors in verb groups, predicate noun phrases and adverbial phrases. This is an example where frequency of practice or use and improvement in error rate do not necessarily go hand in hand. Mothers and fathers used constituents in a similar way and their error rate was also similar. Among the children boys expressed and ellipted more constituents than girls.

In sum, it can be said that all respondents made good use of subject noun phrase and verb group ellipsis. In this way they made their responses cohesive. On the other hand, what they tended to express in ellipted utterances, were adverbial phrases which were the carriers of new information. The difference between the sexes was negligible.

Pronoun and Demonstrative Reference

In addition to ellipsis I also looked at pronoun and demonstrative reference in contingency pairs. What was striking here was the low frequency of these cohesive devices.

INSERT - <u>Table 14: Use of Demonstrative Reference by Sex</u>

As evidenced by data in Table 14 the use of demonstrative reference was sporadic across the groups and sexes.

INSERT - <u>Table 15: Use of Pronoun Reference by Sex</u>

As inspection of Table 15 indicates, pronoun reference was present in approximately ten per cent of answers. The difference between the three groups and sexes was not great. However, it is difficult to judge because of the small numbers involved. It is certain, however, that these are not text building devices favoured by these speakers. Perhaps they are more difficult to use because they have to match their antecedents in number and in some cases in gender. This requires accurate identification and the productive application of the information so obtained.

Conclusion

The interlanguage speaking parents, their children and mates made ample use of ellipsis, thereby tying their answers to the preceding question. This is the way they made their replies cohesive, and not by using pronoun or demonstrative reference. The groups deferred in their ability to produce morphosyntactically and pragmatically well formed replies, the parents being less competent in this respect than the mates, with the children occupying an intermediate position. With respect to the frequency with which the different answer types were handled, the children alternated between an intermediate position and a position closer to mates. There is then a likelihood of a weak parental influence on the cohesiveness of children's speech in dyadic exchanges which deserves further investigation. If my findings apply generally, cohesive devices should receive special attention in across the curriculum language teaching in primary schools.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1: FAULTY ANSWERS BY QUESTION TYPES

	PARENTS		CHILDREN		MATES	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS (N=160)	56	35	11	7	2	1
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS (N=160)	57	36	23	14	2	1
TOTAL QUESTIONS (N=320)	113	35	34	11	4	1

TABLE 2: ANSWER TYPES BY QUESTION TYPES

	N=320	PARENT		CHILDREN		MATES	
		QUESTION		QUESTION		QUESTION	
		<u>YES-NO</u>	<u>WH-</u>	<u>YES-NO</u>	<u>WH-</u>	<u>YES-NO</u>	<u>WH-</u>
		%	%	%	%	%	%
0	UNELABORATED FORMULAIC	11	2	29	4	26	5
1	FRAGMENT	17	27	10	22	13	17
2	ELLIPTED SENTENCE	5	2	2	3	3	3
3	COMPLETE SENTENCE	6	7	4	9	3	7
4	ALTERNATIVE	8	6	3	3	3	5
5	NOT CLASSIFIED	0	1	0.3	0.6	0	0.3
6	CLAUSE	3	5	3	8	3	12
7	ELLIPTED CLAUSE	0.6	0.9	0.3	0.3	0	0.6

TABLE 3: SELECTED ANSWER TYPES BY QUESTION TYPES

	FRAGMENT			ELLIPTED SENTENCE			FULL SENTENCE		
	P	CH	M	P	CH	M	P	CH	M
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTION (N=160)	33	20	27	9	7	5	34	18	16
<u>WH-</u> QUESTION (N=160)	44	44	33	4	18	6	35	41	49
TOTAL (N=320)	43	32	30	7	13	5	35	30	33

TABLE 4: FORMULAIC ANSWERS BY QUESTION TYPES

QUESTION TYPES	ANSWER TYPES: YES			NO			ROUTINE			TOTAL		
	P	Ch.	M	P	Ch.	M	P	Ch.	M	P	Ch.	M
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>YES-NO</u> Q. (N=160)	39	49	47	12	22	18	26	11	15	76	87	80
<u>WH-</u> Q. (N=160)	9	2	0.6	2	1	0.6	18	27	37	29	31	39
TOTAL Q. (N=320)	24	25	26	7	12	9	22	19	25	53	56	69

TABLE 5: FORMULAIC ANSWERS NOT ELABORATED

YES			NO			ROUTINE			TOTAL		
P	Ch.	M	P	Ch.	M	P	Ch.	M	P	Ch.	M
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
36	75	67	26	70	67	11	31	24	24	31	48

TABLE 6: ELABORATION BY QUESTION TYPE

	PARENT	CHILDREN	MATES
(N=320)	%	%	%
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	20	7	10
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	20	15	16
TOTAL	40	22	26

TABLE 7: ELABORATION BY ANSWER TYPE

	PARENT	CHILDREN	MATES
(N=320)	%	%	%
FRAGMENT	14	10	5-
ELLIPTED SENTENCE	5-	5-	5-
COMPLETE SENTENCE	5-	5-	5-
ALTERNATIVE	9	5-	5-
NOT CLASSIFIED	5-	5-	5-
CLAUSE	7	5-	8
ELLIPTED CLAUSE	5-	5-	5-

TABLE: 8 ELLIPTED CONSTITUENTS BY QUESTION TYPES

	PARENTS	CHILDREN	MATES
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	(N = 67)	(N = 39)	(N = 51)
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	(N = 95)	(N = 80)	(N = 61)
TOTAL QUESTIONS	(N = 162)	(N = 119)	(N = 112)
 <u>SUBJECT NP</u>	 %	 %	 %
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	66	77	90
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	88	86	95
TOTAL QUESTIONS	79	83	92
 <u>VERB GROUP</u>			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	61	80	88
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	88	85	82
TOTAL QUESTIONS	77	83	85
 <u>PREDICATE NP</u>			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	25	28	18
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	14	9	5
TOTAL QUESTIONS	19	15	11
 <u>ADVERBIAL P</u>			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	5	8	4
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	8	5	10
TOTAL QUESTIONS	7	6	7
 <u>PREPOSITIONAL P</u>			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	8	5	6
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	3	6	3
TOTAL QUESTIONS	5	6	4
 <u>PREDICATE ADJ.</u>			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	2	4	4
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	1	4	3
TOTAL QUESTIONS	2	4	4

TABLE: 9 LEXICALISED CONSTITUENTS BY QUESTION TYPES

	PARENTS	CHILDREN	MATES
<u>YES-NO QUESTIONS</u>	(N = 67)	(N = 39	(N = 51)
<u>WH- QUESTIONS</u>	(N = 95)	(N = 80)	(N = 61)
TOTAL QUESTIONS	(N = 162)	(N = 119)	(N = 112)
 <u>SUBJECT NP</u>	 %	 %	 %
<u>YES-NO QUESTIONS</u>	27	23	10
<u>WH- QUESTIONS</u>	10	11	3
TOTAL QUESTIONS	17	15	6
 <u>VERB GROUP</u>			
<u>YES-NO QUESTIONS</u>	22	21	16
<u>WH- QUESTIONS</u>	7	13	18
TOTAL QUESTIONS	14	15	17
 <u>PREDICATE NP</u>			
<u>YES-NO QUESTIONS</u>	31	31	35
<u>WH- QUESTIONS</u>	28	34	39
TOTAL QUESTIONS	30	33	37
 <u>ADVERBIAL P</u>			
<u>YES-NO QUESTIONS</u>	45	61	51
<u>WH- QUESTIONS</u>	50	48	57
TOTAL QUESTIONS	48	52	54
 <u>PREPOSITIONAL P</u>			
<u>YES-NO QUESTIONS</u>	16	8	4
<u>WH- QUESTIONS</u>	10	6	12
TOTAL QUESTIONS	12	7	8
 <u>PREDICATE ADJ.</u>			
<u>YES-NO QUESTIONS</u>	6	5	2
<u>WH- QUESTIONS</u>	6	6	5
TOTAL QUESTIONS	6	6	4

TABLE: 10 THE RANK ORDER OF ELLIPTED CONSTITUENT TYPES

PARENTS		CHILDREN		MATES	
SNP	(1)	SNP	(1)	SNP	(1)
VG	(2)	VG	(1)	VG	(2)
PNP	(3)	PNP	(3)	PNP	(3)
AVP	(4)	AVP	(4)	AVP	(4)
PP	(5)	PP	(4)	PP	(6)
PAJ	(6)	PAJ	(6)	PAJ	(6)

TABLE: 11 THE RANK ORDER OF LEXICALISED CONSTITUENT TYPES

PARENTS	CHILDREN	MATES
AVP (1)	AVP (1)	AVP (1)
PNP (2)	PNP (2)	PNP (2)
SNP (3)	SNP (3)	VG (3)
VG (4)	VG (3)	PP (4)
PP (5)	PP (5)	SVP (5)
PAJ (6)	PAJ (6)	PAJ (6)

TABLE 12: NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS ELLIPTING CONSTITUENT TYPES
BY QUESTION TYPES

	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		
	PARENTS	CHILDREN	MATES
SNP			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	8	8	8
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	8	8	8
VG			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	8	8	8
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	8	8	8
PNP			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	8	7	5
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	7	5	2
AVP			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	8	8	8
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	8	8	8
PP			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	4	2	3
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	2	5	2
PAJ			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	1	3	2
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	1	3	2

TABLE 13: NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS LEXICALISING CONSTITUENT TYPES
IN ELLIPTED UTTERANCES BY QUESTION TYPES

	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		
	PARENTS	CHILDREN	MATES
SNP			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	7	5	3
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	6	6	1
VG			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	8	5	6
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	7	7	5
PNP			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	8	6	7
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	8	8	8
AVP			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	8	8	8
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	8	8	8
PP			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	8	2	2
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	7	3	7
PAJ			
<u>YES-NO</u> QUESTIONS	3	2	1
<u>WH-</u> QUESTIONS	4	4	2

TABLE 15: USE OF PRONOUN REFERENCE BY SEX

(N=160)	PARENTS			CHILDREN				MATES	
	FATHER %	MOTHER %	T %	SON %	DAUGHTER %	T %	BOY %	GIRL %	T %
CORRECT	10	16	13	6	11	8	11	13	12
FAULTY	0	1		0	0.6		0	0	0

TABLE 14: USE OF DEMONSTRATIVE REFERENCE BY SEX

	PARENTS		CHILDREN			MATES	
	FATHER %	MOTHER %	SON %	DAUGHTER %		BOY %	GIRL %
CORRECT	3	3	0.6	2.5	1	2	3
FAULTY	0.6	0	0	0		6	0

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- DULAY, H., M. BURT, and S. KRASHEN
1982 Language two. New York: O.U.P.
- GLEASON, J.B. and S. WEINTRAUB
1975 'The acquisition of routines in child language'. Papers and Reports on Child Language Development 10: 89-96.
- GOFFMAN, E.
1969 Where the Action Is. London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press.
- HALLIDAY, M.A.K. AND R. HASAN
1976 Cohesion in English. London: Longman.
- MORGAN, J.L.
1973 'Sentence fragments and the notion 'sentence'', 719-781. In: Kachru Braj B. et al. eds. Issues in linguistics. Papers in honor of Henry and Renee Kahane. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.
- PETERS, A.
1983 Units in Language Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- POPE, E.
1973 'Question answer systems'. Chicago Linguistic Society. Papers from the Regional Meeting, 9: 482-493.
- QUIRK, R. and S. GREENBAUM.
1973 A university grammar of English. London: Longman.
- RADO, M.
'Ellipsis in answers to yes-no and wh- questions in the English of Asian students in Australia'. In: Clyne, M. (ed.) Australia: Meeting Place of Different Languages. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, forthcoming.
- SACKS, H., E.A. SCHEGLOFF and G. JEFFERSON
1974 'A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation'. Language 50/40: 696-735.
- SHOPEN, T.
1973 'Ellipsis as grammatical indeterminacy'. Foundations of Language 10: 65-77.